

## REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 5, 12, and 18 have been amended. Claims 28-37 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1-27 are pending and under consideration.

### Rejection of Claims 1 and 11 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,929,651 issued to Leas et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Leas"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Leas does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "wherein the semiconductor device is inserted into the semiconductor device accommodator," as recited in claim 1.

In item 4, the Office Action asserts that Leas discloses, "an insert module (12, 17 of figure 1) installed on a bottom of the contact module, having a semiconductor device (34 of figure 1) accommodator to accommodate the semiconductor device;..."

Applicants respectfully submit that that Leas does not disclose a "semiconductor device accommodator." Instead, in Figure 1 and col. 5, lines 60- col. 6, line 1, Leas discloses, "Test wafer 30 carries a plurality of integrated circuit test chips 32..., each test chip 32 corresponding to a product chip 34. Test chips 32 are provided in a substantially planar distribution conforming to the distribution of product chips 34 of wafer 18 such that each test chip 32 will be positioned in electrical connection with a correspondingly positioned product chip 34 when test head 16 and product wafer 18 are aligned and engaged for testing purposes."

Applicants respectfully submit that the product chip 34 is not a "semiconductor device accommodator" as the Office Action appears to suggest. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Leas does not teach any "semiconductor device accommodator."

Applicants have further clarified claim 1 by indicating that "the semiconductor device is inserted into the semiconductor device accommodator." In contrast, Leas discloses test chips 32 positioned to be electrically connected to product chips 34, which are not semiconductor device accommodators. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the cited reference.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 2-4 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Leas in view of U.S. Patent 6,720,784 issued to Martter et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Martter"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Leas and Martter, taken separately or in combination, does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "an insert module...having a semiconductor device accommodator to accommodate the semiconductor device..., wherein the semiconductor device is inserted into the semiconductor device accommodator," as recited in claim 1.

As discussed above, Leas does not disclose these features. Applicants respectfully submit that Martter does not cure the deficiencies of Leas. Therefore, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

The Office Action asserts that Leas teaches all of the features of claims 2-4 except for "the insert module is partitioned into a plurality of semiconductor device accommodators by a horizontal partition wall and a vertical partition wall," as recited in claim 2 from which claims 3 and 4 depend. The Office Action appears to assert that the sockets 26 of Figure 2 of Martter teach these features.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Leas does not teach a "semiconductor device accommodator," and Martter does not appear to show any walls. Instead, the sockets 26 appear to be on an electronic circuit board without walls in Figure 2. Because neither Leas nor Martter teaches "the insert module...partitioned into a plurality of semiconductor device accommodators by a horizontal partition wall and a vertical partition wall," as recited in claim 2, the combination of Leas and Martter could not teach the features of claim 2.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that one having ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine these two references.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 1 and 2 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 2 and include all of the features of claim 2. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 3 and 4 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Objection to Claims 5-10 and 12-27

The Office Action objects to claims 5-10 and 12-27 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claims 5, 12, and 18 have been rewritten in independent form to obviate this objection. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Summary

Claims 1-27 are pending and under consideration. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references taken alone or in combination disclose the present claimed invention.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

December 23, 2005

By:

Paul F. Daebeler

Paul F. Daebeler

Registration No. 35,852

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501